

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed October 21, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,475,735 (Williams et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,327,144 (Stilp et al.). The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Stilp et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0037729 (Dupont et al.). The Examiner rejected claims 4-5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Stilp et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,613 (Takahara et al.). The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 and 18-22 as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Dupont et al. The Examiner rejected claims 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Dupont et al. and in further view of Takahara et al.

2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10-11, and 22. Claims 1-22 are presently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 10-11, and 22 are independent. Applicant has amended the title of the invention.

3. Response to §103 Rejections

a. Williams et al. and Stilp et al. References

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Stilp et al. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10. Claims 1 and 10, as amended, clearly distinguish over the combination of Williams et al. and Stilp et al. because the combination of Williams et al. and Stilp et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of either of these claims. At a minimum, for instance,

the combination of Williams et al. and Stilp et al. fails to teach or suggest “*in response to the alert, changing the registered location to match the current location,*” as recited in amended claims 1 and 10.

In rejecting claims 1 and 10, the Examiner indicated that Williams et al. is silent on responsively activating an alert if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device. To overcome this deficiency of Williams et al., the Examiner relied on Stilp et al. for teaching activation of an alarm if the wireless device is not in the predetermined (i.e., registered) location.

With respect to amended claims 1 and 10, at best, Stilp et al. teaches (i) indicating an alarm condition when the current location is not within the prescribed range, and (ii) paging a given telephone to cause it to initiate a signal transmission so as to allow a system to locate a telephone that has failed to register itself with the cellular system, and that such a lack-of-signal transmission detection feature could be used to generate an alarm for subscribers at remote locations. (See, e.g., Stilp et al., col. 6, lines 5-21). However, Stilp et al., alone or in combination with Williams et al., does not teach or suggest *in response to the alert, changing the registered location to match the current location*, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Applicant submits that claims 1 and 10 are allowable because the combination of Williams et al. and Stilp et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 10. Further, because claims 2-9 depend on an allowable claim and necessarily include all of the limitations of the allowable claim, claims 2-9 are allowable as well.

b. Williams et al. and DuPont et al. References

The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of DuPont et al. Applicant has amended independent

claims 11 and 22. Claims 11 and 22, as amended, clearly distinguish over the combination of Williams et al. and DuPont et al. because the combination of Williams et al. and DuPont et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of either of these claims. At a minimum, for instance, Williams et al. and DuPont et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest *“means for changing the registered location to match the current location in response to the alert,”* as recited in amended claims 11 and 22.

In rejecting claims 11 and 22, the Examiner indicated that Williams et al. is silent on alert logic arranged to provide an alert in response to the determination that the current location does not match the registered location. To overcome this deficiency of Williams et al., the Examiner relied on DuPont et al. for teaching alert logic (i.e., software) to provide an alert in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered/expected location.

With respect to amended claims 11 and 22, at best, DuPont et al. teaches (i) an expected path for the monitored person is determined by identifying a sequence of successive places or checkpoints, (ii) a real path followed by the monitored person is detected and compared with the expected path, and (iii) an alert is sent to at least one individual when the real path differs from the expected path. (See, e.g., DuPont et al., Abstract). However, DuPont et al., alone or in combination with Williams et al., does not teach or suggest means for changing the registered location to match the current location in response to a determination that the current location does not match the registered location (i.e., in response to the alert, as recited in claims 11 and 22).

Applicant submits that claims 11 and 22 are allowable because the combination of Williams et al. and DuPont et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 11

and 22. Further, because claims 12-21 depend on an allowable claim and necessarily include all of the limitations of the allowable claim, claims 12-21 are allowable as well.

4. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: January 6, 2006

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432